# SUBGENERIC RELATIONSHIPS IN THE EUTHECOSOMATOUS PTEROPOD GENUS LIMACINA BOSC, 1817.

# FRED E WELLS

Western Australian Museum, Perth, Australia

# **SUMMARY**

The relationships between the species of the genus Limacina are examined and a new subgeneric classification based on anatomical characteristics is proposed. The subgenus Limacina Bosc, 1817, includes five species: L bulimoides (d'Orbigny, 1836), L helicina (Phipps, 1774), L lesueuri (d'Orbigny, 1836), L retroversa (Fleming, 1823), and L trochiformis (d'Orbigny, 1836). The subgenus Limacina is characterized primarily by a dorsal mantle cavity, pallial gland of one cell zone, and a common pattern of reproductive morphology. Free-floating egg masses are deposited by all five species. The subgenus Thilea Strebel, 1908, includes a single species, L helicoides Jeffreys, 1877, which has the mantle cavity offset to the right side and a pallial gland of two cell zones. The reproductive morphology of L helicoides is similar to that of the subgenus Limacina, but encapsulated young are retained in the mucous gland of the female and the species is ovoviviparous. The subgenus Embolus Jeffreys, 1870, has the single species Limacina inflata (d'Orbigny, 1836). The reproductive morphology of L inflata is substantially different from the other species of the genus; the mucous and albumen glands and the penis are absent in L inflata and the prostate gland develops into a spermatophore. Females of L inflata retain developing embryos in the mantle cavity where they are attached to the mantle lining

#### INTRODUCTION

Euthecosomatous pteropods are a small group of opisthobranchs that are highly specialised for a holoplanktonic existence. The specialisations make it difficult to understand relationships within the Euthecosomata. For many years two families, Limacinidae Gray, 1847, and Cavolimidae Fischer, 1883, have been recognised (Meisenheimer, 1905; Tesch, 1946; van der Spoel, 1967). In a thorough examination of the group Rampal (1973; 1975) has recently divided the Cavoliniidae into two families, Cavoliniidae sensu stricto and Creseiidae Rampal, 1975. Of the three euthecosome families the Limacinidae are considered to be the most primitive (Tesch, 1946; van der Spoel, 1967; Rampal, 1975).

The family Limacinidae has a single genus, *Limacina* Bosc, 1817 with seven widely distributed species. *Limacina helicina* (Phipps, 1774) is a polar species and *L. retroversa* (Fleming, 1823) is a temperate species Both are bipolar, occurring in the northern and southern hemispheres with distributional gaps in the equatorial regions. Four species are distributed throughout the tropical and subtropical oceanic regions: *L. bulimoides* (d'Orbigny, 1836), *L. inflata* (d'Orbigny, 1836), *L. lesueuri* (d'Orbigny, 1836), and

L. trochiformis (d'Orbigny, 1836). All six of the above species are epipelagic. The only bathypelagic member of the genus, L. helicoides Jeffreys, 1877, has been recorded from the North and South Atlantic and the South Pacific Oceans (van der Spoel, 1967).

Although the species are well known the genus Limacina has been divided into a confusing array of subgenera. The most recent attempt to establish relationships within the genus was that of van der Spoel (1967). Three subgenera were recognised primarily on the basis of shell shape: Limacina Bosc, 1817, with L. helicina and L. retroversa; Thilea Strebel, 1908, with L. inflata, L. lesueuri and L. helicoides; and Munthea van der Spoel, 1967, with L. bulimoides and L. trochiformis. In her excellent examination of the euthecosome fauna of the Mediterranean Sea, Rampal (1975) has discussed reasons for removing L. helicoides from the genus Limacina, and placing it in the genus Thilea Strebel, 1908.

The reproductive mechanisms and morphology of all seven species have now been investigated (Lalli and Wells, 1973; Wells and Lalli, in prep.). This work has shown *L. inflata* to have brood protection and a reproductive anatomy unlike that of other species of *Limacina*. This information on reproduction should be incorporated into our understanding of relationships between the various species, and the subgeneric classification of *Limacina* should be modified accordingly.

#### DISCUSSION

(a) General Limacina pattern

Table 1 summarises the published information which can be used to indicate relationships between the various species of Limacina. Five species: L. bulimoides, L. helicina, L. lesueuri, L. retroversa and L. trochiformis, all fit into one grouping These species are united by the following characteristics: mantle cavity dorsal, parapodia well developed, pallial gland of one cell zone, 'balancer' or excurrent siphon in the right angle of the mantle cavity and epipelagic habitat. All species deposit free-floating egg masses, and there is a common reproductive morphology.

The general pattern of the reproductive system of Limacina is as follows. The hermaphroditic gonad is located in the upper shell whorls, and a hermaphrodite duct leads from the gonad to the albumen and mucous gland. The prostate gland is located at the base of the penis. All species are protandric hermaphrodites. During the male stage the lower portion of the gonad and hermaphrodite duct are swollen by endogenous sperm. After copulation has occurred exogenous sperm are stored in the hermaphrodite duct. During copulation sperm move through the common genital pore, along a ciliary tract on the right side of the head, and onto the penis. During the female stage free-floating egg masses are laid (Wells and Lalli, in prep.).

However, there are also three characters on Table 1 which appear to separate the species: presence or absence of a tentacular lobe on the anterior surface of the parapodia, height of the shell spire and type of shell structure. The five species are spread over all three subgenera proposed by van der Spoel (1967), but Rampal (1975) believed there was no need to subdivide the group. The presence or absence of a tentacular lobe is a minor characteristic which varies even within the species L helicina. The shape of the shell spire varies within the species L retroversa (Tesch, 1946) and in L helicina (McGowan, 1963). Microscopic shell structure varies within the species L helicina and L bullimoides (Rampal, 1975).

<sup>1.</sup> The use of the term 'balancer' originated with Pelseneer (Rampal, 1975). Pelseneer, working with preserved material from the Challenger Expedition, suggested the coiled shells of Limacina would be unstable while the animals were swimming. The 'balancer' was thought to provide stability in the water column. In fact the animals are unable to travel in a straight line and swim upwards in a spural path as described by Morton (1964a). Boas found the 'balancer' to function in evacuating the mantle cavity in the pseudothecosome genus Peraclis (cited in Rampal, 1975). I have examined live animals of all three euthecosome families collected in a two year sampling program off Barbados (Wells. 1976). In all species examined the 'balancer' served to channel water out of the mantle cavity without an apparent stabilising function. The structure should be regarded as an excurrent siphon, and not a 'balancer'.

Thus these five species of the genus Limacina should be regarded as belonging to a single subgenus Limacina Bosc, 1817, with the characteristics outlined in the first paragraph of this discussion. Limacina helicina (Phipps, 1774) is the type species of the genus.

### (b) Limacina helicoides

Limacina helicoides differs from the other members of the genus in the following characteristics: the mantle cavity is offset to the right side, the parapodia are notics well developed as in the other species, the pallial gland has two cell zones, and the excurrent siphon is in a slightly different position. All of these characters clearly separate L helicoides from the subgenus Limacina. Rampal (1975) cited two additional differences: L helicoides is the only bathypelagic member of the genus and it is ovoviviparous. As Tesch (1946) has observed, bathypelagic species are often ovoviviparous. Three cavoliniids of the genus Clio are known to have embryo retention and all are bathypelagic (Lalli and Wells, 1973). The reproductive morphology of L helicoides does not differ from that of the subgenus Limacina. Encapsulated embryos are simply retained in the mucous gland off the femals during development (Wells and Lalli, in prep.) Limacina helicoides can certainly be differentiated from the other species of the genus, but the differences do not warrant a generic separation. The subgenus Thilea Strebel, 1908, should be used for this species.

Three of the characteristics on Table 1 are used by Rampal (1975) in assessing the evolutionary relationships of the euthecosomes: position of the mantle cavity, cellular structure of the pallial gland, and location of the excurrent siphon. In all three characteristics Rampal believes L. helicoides shows a more primitive structure than the other Limacinidae and the Creseiidae and Cavoliniidae.

#### (c) Limacina inflata

As is shown on Table 1, Limacina inflata shares many characteristics of the subgenus Limacina, such as the dorsal mantle cavity, position of excurrent siphon, well developed parapodia, pallial gland of one cell zone and epipelagic habitat. The substantial differences separating L inflata from the other species lie in the method of reproduction. Developing embryos are retained attached to the mantle lining of the female and young are released as free-swimming veligers (Lalli and Wells, 1973). The reproductive morphology is marked by the loss of the albumen and mucous glands and the penis. The prostate gland is elaborated into a spermatophore for sperm transfer and is directly connected by the hermaphrodite duct to the gonad. The direct link between the prostate and gonad has not been reported in any other thecosome (Wells and Lalli, in prep.). The reproductive modifications of Limacina inflata can be used to clearly separate the species at the subgeneric level. I suggest using the subgenus Embolus Jeffreys, 1870, for Limacina inflata, as it was used by Johnson (1934)

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I thank Mrs. S.M. Slack-Smith for critically reviewing the manuscript.

## REFERENCES

BOLTOVSKY, D. 1975. Study of surface-shell features in Thecosomata (Pteropoda: Mollusca) by means of scanning electron microscopy. Mar. Biol. 27: 165-172.

JOHNSON, C.W. 1934. List of marine Molluscs of the Atlantic coast from Labrador to Texas. Proc. Boston Soc. Nat. Hist., 40(1): 1-204.

LALLI, C.M. and F.E. WELLS. 1973. Brood protection in an epipelagic thecosomatous pteropod, Spiratella ('Limacina') inflata (d'Orbigny). Buil. Mar. Sci. 23(4): 933-941.

McGOWAN, J.A. 1963. Geographical variation in Limacina helicina in the North Pacific. Systematics Assoc. Publ. No. 5. Speciation in the Sea. J.P. Harding and N. Tebble (Eds.) pp. 109-128. MEISENHEIMER, J. 1905. Pteropoda. Wiss. Engetn. "Valdivia" 9: 1-314

MORTON, J.E. 1954a. The biology of Limacina retroversa. J. Mar. Biol. Ass. U.K. 33: 297-312. MORTON, J.E. 1954b. The pelagic Mollusca of the Benguela Current. Part 1. First survey, R.R.S. William Scoresby' March 1950, with an account of the reproductive survey.

'William Scoresby', March 1950, with an account of the reproductive system and sexual succession of Limacina bulimoides, Discovery Rept. 27: 163-199.

RAMPAL, J. 1973. Phylogenie des Ptéropodes Thécosomes d'apres la structure de la coquille et la morphologie du manteau. C.R. Acad. Sc. Faris 277: 1345-1348.

RAMPAL, J. 1975. Les Thécosomes (Moiluscques pelagiques). Systematique et evolution. Ecologie et biogéographie Méditerraneennes. D. Sc. Thesis, Univ. Marseille, 485pp.

SPOEL, S. van der. 1967. Euthecosomata, a group with remarkable developmental stages. (Gastropoda, Pteropoda). Gorinchem, J. Noordu yn en Zoon N.V. 375pp.

TESCH, J.J. 1946. The thecosomatous pteropods. I. The Atlantic. Dana. Rep. 28: 1-82.

WELLS, F.E. 1976. Seasonal patterns of abundance and reproduction of euthecosomatous pteropods

off Barbados, West Indies. Veliger 18(3): 241-248.
WELLS, F.E. and C.M. L'ALLI' Reproduction in the cosomatous pteropod genus Limacina. In prep.

TABLE 1. Characteristics of Limacina species

	Subgenus Limacina	cina				Subgenus Thilea	Subgenus Embolus	Source
Structure	L. bulimoides	L. helicina	L. lesueuri	L retroversa	L. trochifornis L. helicoides	L. helicoides	L inflata	
Position of mantle cavity.	Dorsal	Dorsal	Dorsal	Dorsal	Dorsai	Right lateral	Dorsal	Rampal, 1975.
Parapodia	Well developed	Well developed		Well developed Well developed Well developed		Poorly developed	Well developed Rampal, 1975.	Rampal, 1975.
Habitat	Epipelagic	Epipelagic	Epipelagic	Epipelagic	Epipelagic	Bathypelagic	Epipelagic	Wells and Lalli, in prep
Pallial gland	One cell zone	One cell zone	One cell zone	One cell zone	One cell zone	Two cell zones	One cell zone	Rampal, 1975.
Excurrent siphon	Right corner of mantle cavity	Right corner of mantle cavity	Right corner of mantle cavity	Right corner of mantle cavity	Right corner of mantle cavity	Offset	Right corner of mantle cavity	Rampal, 1975.
Reproductive mechanisms	Ovip osition	Ovip osition	Oviposition	Oviposition	Oviposition	Ovoviviparity	Brood protection	Lalli & Wells, 1973, Wells & Lalli, in prep.
Reproductive morphology	Typical	Typical	Typical	Typical	Typical	Typical	Modified	Wells & Lalli, in prep.
Tentacular lobe Absent	Absent	Present or absent	Absent	Present	Absent	Absent	Absent	van der Spoel, 1967.
Shell spire	Normal	Flattened	Flattened	Normal	Normal	Flattened	Flattened	van der Spoel, 1967.
Shell structure	Prismatic and cross-lamellar	Prismatic and cross-lamellar	Cross-lam ellar	Cross-lamellar	Prismatic	Cross-lamellar	Prismatic	Boltovsky, 1975; Rampal, 1975.
Distribution	Tropical	Polar	Tropical	Tropical	Temperate	Bathypelagic	Tropical	van der Spoel, 190